

REMARKS

Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

Amendment of Claims

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 52, 60, 68 and 77 to recite the feature of “wherein the cover member protects a display screen of the second display device.” This feature is supported by, for example, page 6, lines 7-9 of the specification of the present application. In addition, in order to clarify the claimed invention and correct any possible informalities in the claims, Applicants are amending Claims 52, 60, 68 and 77 to change “display panel” to “display device.”

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner’s rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 51-57, 59-66, 68-74 and 76-84

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 51-57 [sic 52-57], 59-66, 68-74 and 76-84 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami (US 6,967,632) in view of Priestman et al. (US 6,812,954), Nakamura et al. (US 5,734,914) and Nakai et al. (US 6,072,454). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in the Final Rejection, the Examiner contends that Minami discloses “a cover member comprising a first display panel 4 for displaying an image.” Applicants respectfully

disagree. Liquid crystal display 4 in Minami is not a cover member. Liquid crystal display 4 does not cover anything and cannot be characterized as a cover member. One skilled in the art would never consider display 4 in Minami as a cover member (and the Examiner provides no explanation as to how display 4 could be viewed as a cover member). In fact, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Minami of a cover member.

In contrast, independent Claims 52, 60, 68 and 77 clearly recite “a cover member.” As discussed at page 6, lines 7-9 of the specification and as shown in Figs. 1A-1C of the present application, a cover member is an element which protects the second display device (comprising a touch input tablet). Claims 52, 60, 68 and 77 have been amended to clearly recite this feature. Minami does not disclose or suggest anything remotely similar to this claimed feature and provides no protection for the display screen of the second display device.

Further, Minami teaches a multi-monitor comprising a first display device and a second display device having a display screen smaller than the first display. See e.g. Col. 1, lines 57-63 in Minami. Hence, this is not the claimed cover member, cannot protect the second display, and one skilled in the art would not consider this to be a cover member.

Furthermore, one of the problems that Minami wishes to solve is that if two CRT displays are placed side by side, they take up a large space, thereby extremely narrowing the work space on a desk. See e.g. Col. 1, lines 46-49 in Minami. The way that Minami solves this problem is by having a second display screen smaller than the first display. See e.g. Col. 1, lines 57-63.

In contrast, Priestman appears to teach a portable electronic device having a lower half 204 which comprises an LCD video display essentially identical to a video display 220. See e.g. Col. 8, lines 38-42 in Priestman. This is completely different than what is disclosed in Minami, and there is no reason or way for one skilled in the art to combine Minami with Priestman. Therefore, the

combination of these references is improper.

Therefore, independent Claims 52, 60, 68 and 77 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 58, 67, 75 and 85

The Examiner also rejects Claims 58, 67, 75 and 85 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Priestman et al., Nakamura et al. and Nakai et al., and further in view of Watanabe (US 6,098,055). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are also adding new Claims 86-103.

The feature of new dependent Claims 86, 89, 92, 95 is supported by, for example, the specification at page 9, lines 12-17. The feature of new dependent Claims 87, 90, 93, 96 is supported by, for example, Fig. 1A. The feature of new dependent Claims 88, 91, 94, 97 is supported by, for example, the specification at page 3, lines 15-17. The features of new independent Claim 98 are supported by, for example, the specification at page 6, lines 10-15. The feature of new dependent Claim 99 is supported by, for example, Fig. 15. The feature of new dependent Claim 100 is supported by, for example, Fig. 14. The features of new Claims 101-103 are supported by, for example, Figs. 4A, 4B.

As a RCE is being filed herewith, these new claims should be entered and considered at this time. For similar reasons as discussed above, these claims should also be allowed.

If a fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, the new claims, or the RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: September 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500
Customer No. 26568